REMARKS

This communication is a full and timely response to the aforementioned non-final Office Action dated September 30, 2008. By this communication, claims 1-17, 19 and 20 are amended, and claims 21-23 are added. Claim 18 is not amended and remains in the application. Thus, claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10 and 17 are independent.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1, 2, 4-15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillingham et al. (U.S. 6,327,608, hereinafter "Dillingham") in view of Berchtold et al. (U.S. 6,678,705, hereinafter "Berchtold").

Without acquiescing to this rejection, independent claims 1, 10 and 17 have each been amended to emphasize distinctions over the applied references. Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentable over the applied references for at least the following reasons.

An exemplary embodiment of the present invention provides a data management system that includes a client and a server. The exemplary system permits a client to designate a storage folder within a folder tree structure of the server so that an attached file is stored in the designated folder.

The client includes a first transmission portion that sends an inquiry mail to the server for inquiring about a folder tree structure at the server (see, e.g., step S103 in Figure 5). The server includes a second transmission portion that transmits a representation of the folder tree structure to the client by mail in response to the inquiry mail sent from the client (see, e.g., S109 in Figure 5). Figure 6 illustrates an example of a folder tree structure that is at the server. In the example of Figure 6, the root folder contains two subordinate folders: folders A and B. Folder A contains a subordinate folder of folder AA. Figure 8 illustrates an example of a representation of a folder tree structure that is sent to the client by mail from the server. The client receives the mail sent from the server that includes the representation of the tree structure at the server.

The client includes a third transmission portion that designates a storage folder within the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from the server by altering the representation of the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from the server, and sending a reply email to the server that contains the altered representation of the folder tree structure and a file to be attached in the designated storage folder. The server, in turn, stores the attached file in the received reply email by determining the designated storage folder in the folder tree structure based on the alteration of the representation of the folder tree structure that is sent in the reply email from the client.

Figures 9-13 illustrates examples of how the storage location in a folder tree structure is designated by modifying the representation of the folder tree structure sent from the server to the client. For example, in Figure 9, the client inserts a line below "Folder AA" in the representation of the folder tree structure sent from the server to designate folder AA as the storage folder for "File X," which is sent with the reply email from the client to the server. In the example of Figure 10, the client designates that "File X" is to be stored in "Folder AA" and "Folder B" by inserting a line below each of these folders. In the example of Figure 11, File X and File Y are both stored in "Folder AA" based on the alteration of the representation of the folder tree structure. In the example of Figure 12, Files Y, Z and X are stored in respective folders. For example, by altering the representation of the folder tree structure sent from the server, the client in the example of Figure 12 has inserted two lines below "Folder AA" and one line below "Folder B." Based on the order in which attached files are identified in the reply email, the server determines that files Y and Z are to be stored in "Folder AA" and file X is to be stored in "Folder B." Figure 13 illustrates an example in which a plurality of attached files are designated to be stored in one ore more storage files within the folder tree structure based on the insertion of a numerical character below the respective storage folder(s), where the numerical characters respectively correspond to an order in which the attached files are identified in the reply email from the client to the server. For example, in Figure 13, the server determines that File Z, which is the third identified attached file, is to be stored in the "Root Folder" and in "Folder AA," based on the client's alteration of the

representation of the folder tree structure in the reply mail sent from the client to the server.

Accordingly, the disclosed embodiment provides that the client designates a storage folder within the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from the server in the form of a reply mail sent from the server by altering the representation of the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from the server, and sending a reply mail with the altered representation of the folder tree structure and an attached file to the server.

In addition, the disclosed embodiment provides that the server stores an attached file in a designated storage folder when a replay mail is received from the client with an attached file by determining the designated storage folder in the folder tree structure based on an alteration of the representation of the folder tree structure that is sent in the reply mail from the client.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 17 recite various features of the above-described exemplary embodiment.

In particular, claim 1 recites that a third transmission portion of the client designates a storage folder within the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from the server in the form of a reply to the mail sent from the server by altering the representation of the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from the server, and sending a reply mail with the altered representation of the folder tree structure and an attached file to the server. Claim 1 also recites that a storage portion of the server stores the attached file in the storage folder as designated in the reply mail, in response to the reply mail sent from the client.

Claim 17 recites a data management server that comprises a transmission portion sending a representation of a folder tree structure to a client by mail in response to an inquiry mail sent from the client. In addition, claim 17 recites that the server comprises a storage portion storing an attached file into a designated storage folder when a reply mail is received from the client with an attached file by determining the designated storage folder in the folder tree structure based on an alteration of the representation of the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent by the transmission portion that is sent in the reply mail from the client.

Claim 10 recites a computer-readable recording medium having a data management product recorded thereon that causes a computer to execute operations corresponding to the constituent elements of the data management server as recited in claim 17.

Dillingham and Berchtold do not disclose or suggest these features of claim 1, 10 and 17. Dillingham discloses a server administration technique in which a client can browse and administer file directories resident on a server. Dillingham discloses that a user interface (UI) is installed on the client device in response to an HTTP request from the client, and the user interfaces allows the client to access a cached version of the file directories (see Abstract, Column 2, line 51 to Column 3, line 2, and Column 7, lines 10-32).

However, in contrast to claim 1, Dillingham does not disclose or suggest that the client designates a storage folder within a folder tree structure contained in a mail sent from the server by altering the representation folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from the server, and sends a reply mail with the altered representation of the folder tree structure and an attached file. In addition, in contrast to claim 1, Dillingham does not disclose or suggest that the server stores the attached file in the storage folder as designated in the reply mail, in response to the reply mail sent from the client.

Furthermore, Dillingham does not disclose or suggest that the server stores an attached file into a designated storage folder when a reply mail is received from the client with an attached file by determining the designated storage folder in the folder tree structure based on an alteration of the representation of the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent by the transmission portion that is sent in the reply mail from the client, as recited in claims 10 and 17.

Berchtold also does not disclose or suggest these features of claims 1, 10 and 17. Berchtold discloses an architecture for document archival in which a client sends an email to a server to store a file based on the email address used by the client. For instance, if the archiving server is given a name of "Save Me" and an Internet address of "saveme.com," the client can instruct the archiving server to store a file in a folder "ABC" of the archiving server by sending an attachment to the email address "abc@saveme.com" (see Column 3, lines 9-24).

However, similar to Dillingham, Berchtold does not disclose or suggest that the client designates a storage folder within a folder tree structure contained in a mail sent from the server by altering the representation folder tree structure contained in the mail sent from the server, and sends a reply mail with the altered representation of the folder tree structure and an attached file, as recited in claim 1. In addition, in contrast to claim 1, Berchtold does not disclose or suggest that the server stores the attached file in the storage folder as designated in the reply mail, in response to the reply mail sent from the client.

Furthermore, similar to Dillingham, Berchtold does not disclose or suggest that the archiving server stores an attached file into a designated storage folder when a reply mail is received from the client with an attached file by determining the designated storage folder in the folder tree structure based on an alteration of the representation of the folder tree structure contained in the mail sent by the transmission portion that is sent in the reply mail from the client, as recited in claims 10 and 17.

Accordingly, Dillingham and Berchtold do not disclose or suggest all the recited features of claims 1, 10 and 17. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 10 and 17 are patentable over Dillingham and Berchtold, since Dillingham and Berchtold, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every recited feature of claims 1, 10 and 17.

Furthermore, in view of the distinctions discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not have reason or been motivated to modify Dillingham and Berchtold in such a manner as to arrive at, or otherwise render obvious, the inventions of claims 1, 10 and 17.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 10 and 17, as well as claims 2-9, 11-16 and 18-23 which depend therefrom, are patentable over Dillingham and Berchtold.

B. Dependent claims 3, 16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillingham in view of Berchtold and further in view of Mutton et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147840, hereinafter "Mutton").

Mutton does not disclose or suggest the above-described features of claims 1, 10 and 17 that Dillingham and Berchtold fail to disclose or suggest. Consequently, Mutton cannot cure the deficiencies of Dillingham and Berchtold for failing to disclose or suggest all the recited features of claims 1, 10 and 17.

The foregoing explanation of the patentability of independent claims 1, 10 and 17 is sufficiently clear such that it is believed to be unnecessary to separately demonstrate the patentability of the dependent claims at this time. However, Applicant reserves the right to do should it become appropriate. Furthermore, Applicant does not acquiesce to any of the Office's assertions not specifically addressed above. Applicant reserves the right to address any of the Office's assertions not specifically addressed above.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a favorable examination and consideration of the instant application are respectfully requested.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 29, 2008

By: /Jonathan R. Bowser/
Jonathan R. Bowser
Registration No. 54574

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620